
The Common Style of "Common Sense"

Author(s): Lee Sigelman, Colin Martindale, Dean McKenzie

Source: *Computers and the Humanities*, Vol. 30, No. 5, Computers and Historians (1996/1997), pp. 373-379

Published by: Springer

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30204657>

Accessed: 18/01/2010 18:40

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=springer>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Springer is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Computers and the Humanities*.

The Common Style of *Common Sense*

Lee Sigelman*

Department of Political Science, The George Washington University, Washington, DC 20052, USA
e-mail: lees@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu

Colin Martindale*

Department of Psychology, University of Maine, Orono, ME 04469-5742, USA

Dean McKenzie*

Psychological Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

Key words: *Common Sense*, content analysis, forcefulness, simplicity, stylistic analysis, Thomas Paine

Abstract

The extraordinary impact of Thomas Paine's *Common Sense* has often been attributed to its style – to the simplicity and forcefulness with which Paine expressed ideas that many others before him had expressed. Comparative analysis of *Common Sense* and other pre-Revolutionary pamphlets suggests that *Common Sense* was indeed stylistically unique; no other pamphleteer came close to matching Paine's combination of simplicity and forcefulness.

Thomas Paine's *Common Sense* was the spark that ignited the American Revolution. In *Common Sense*, Paine, an Englishman only recently arrived in America, launched frontal attacks on the institution of monarchy in general and on the British crown in particular, and painted a bleak portrait of the oppressiveness and injustice of British colonial rule. Deriding the very idea of monarchy and ridiculing George III as "the royal brute of England," Paine sounded a clarion call for American independence.

* Lee Sigelman is Professor of Political Science at The George Washington University. His research interests range widely throughout the social sciences, including research methods, mass communication, political behavior, and political culture. He has recently published articles in *Computers and the Humanities* analyzing the work of Raymond Chandler and Edith Wharton.

Colin Martindale is Professor of Psychology at the University of Maine. He is author of a number of articles and books on content analysis, literary history, and other topics. A recent book is *The Clockwork Muse: The Predictability of Artistic Change* (New York: Basic Books). He is Executive Editor of *Empirical Studies of the Arts*.

Dean McKenzie is Professional Officer/Statistician for Psychological Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia. He is author of several articles concerned with machine learning and artificial intelligence.

Paine wrote *Common Sense* at the behest of Benjamin Rush, a strong supporter of independence who, fearful of the consequences of putting his own views on the line, convinced Paine that he had nothing to fear from the reaction to publication of such views. A largely unschooled but gifted writer bitterly opposed to monarchy and deeply sympathetic to the cause of independence, Paine approached the task with dispatch, promptly producing a document that, though originally intended as a series of letters to newspapers, circulated as a pamphlet, a prominent communications medium of the pre-Revolutionary era.

Paine's primary points in *Common Sense*, as one commentator has aptly summarized them, were three: "The English system is corrupt, despotic, and contemptible; reconciliation with such a system is a foolish and delusive recompense for American suffering; America should be and can become an independent republic" (Smith, 1938, p. 23). These ideas were by no means novel. John Adams, for one, considered them singularly unoriginal (Foner, 1976, p. 82), and historian Merrill Jensen (1967, p. xiv) reminds us that they had been appearing in newspaper essays and resolutions of

town meetings for more than a decade before *Common Sense* was published.

Nonetheless, Paine's pamphlet burst forth, as General Charles Lee proclaimed at the time, "like Jove in Thunder" (quoted by Keane, 1995, p. 111), radically redefining the terms of the debate and lending enormous impetus to the push for independence. Even Adams, who considered Paine "a bad character" (quoted in Fruchtman, 1994, p. 10) and once described *Common Sense* as "a poor, ignorant, malicious, short-sighted, crapulous mass" (quoted in Hawke, 1974, p. 49), conceded that "without the pen of the author of 'Common Sense,' the sword of Washington would have been raised in vain" (quoted by Fruchtman, 1994, p. 78). It has been estimated that a copy of *Common Sense* was read by virtually every literate man, woman, and child in the colonies and was read to a substantial portion of the illiterates. In an era when a popular newspaper might have two thousand readers and a like number of copies of a typical pamphlet might be printed, *Common Sense* raced through twenty-five editions and reached hundreds of thousands in America and abroad in the year it appeared (Edwards, 1974; Foner, 1976). Considering its extraordinarily rapid and thorough circulation through the colonial population, Jensen (1967, p. lxvi) ranks it as perhaps the all-time best-seller in American history. It reached virtually everyone and had a dramatic effect on virtually everyone it reached. Historian John Keane (1995, pp. 110–111) puts Paine's contribution to the Revolutionary struggle on a par with those of "George Washington on the battlefield and Benjamin Franklin on the diplomatic front," and Sir George Trevelyan concluded that "It would be difficult to name any human composition which has had an effect at once so instant, so extended and so lasting" as that of *Common Sense* (quoted by Woodward, 1946, p. 80).

If *Common Sense* said nothing new, why did it have such an extraordinary impact? Historians of the Revolutionary period have proposed two complementary answers to this question: the accessibility of Paine's language and the forcefulness with which he made his arguments. Paine viewed accessibility and forcefulness as rhetorically vital, reasoning "that if an argument did not carry force and conviction there was no sense in printing it at all" and that "if it were so intricate in style and expression that only the learned could gather its full import most of its possible readers were thus excluded" (quoted by Woodward, 1946, p. 68).

Reflecting both his roots in the laboring classes and his egalitarian political orientation, Paine, unlike other

polemicists of his day, "addressed his appeals primarily to the man of ordinary understanding rather than to the man of taste or learning" (Aldridge, 1959, p. 27). To communicate with such an audience, he had to craft his arguments in simple words and sentences. As he himself put it, "As it is my design to make those that can scarcely read understand, I shall therefore avoid every literary ornament and put it in language as plain as the alphabet" (quoted by Foner, 1976, p. 83). In this endeavor no less an authority than Thomas Jefferson judged him successful; in Jefferson's words, "No writer has exceeded Paine in ease and familiarity of style, in perspicuity of expression, happiness of elucidation, and in simple and unassuming language" (quoted by Keane, 1995, p. 114).

It is one thing to make one's ideas widely accessible. It is something else again to change people's minds and stir them into action. Accordingly, many historians have pointed to the forcefulness of Paine's language – its energy and vividness – as the second key to understanding the impact of *Common Sense*. With more than a trace of understatement it has been written that "Nothing Paine said in the pamphlet was understated" and that he wrote

... grippingly, using images and metaphors of a high, sophisticated caliber. . . . His images, lively and sharp, were profoundly meaningful to his readers who understood exactly what he meant when he not merely belittled the king of England but turned him into a monster. . . . [He] couched his argument in a language designed to inflame, to convince his readers that there were no alternatives to separation from England and in effect to get them to go to war against the English government. He offered a good deal of his message consequently in extreme terms. Monarchy was always evil, kings eternally animalistic, noblemen invariably voracious, the people consistently virtuous (Fruchtman, 1994, pp. 63, 64, 69).

Paine's tone, it has been argued, was altogether different from the cold legalism, the "decorous and reasonable" language, of previous pamphleteers (Foner, 1976, p. 82–83). It is the sheer forcefulness of *Common Sense*, working in conjunction with the accessibility of its language, that is widely seen as responsible for the reaction the pamphlet evoked.

But just how accessible and forceful was *Common Sense*? There is no gainsaying its reputation, as attested by Paine himself, by his allies and foes alike among his contemporaries, and by later generations of scholars.

But insofar as we are aware, the widespread impression that *Common Sense* departed radically in style and tone from other political tracts of the pre-Revolutionary era has never been put to a systematic test. Our purpose here, using tools of modern textual analysis, is to subject these impressions to critical scrutiny.

1. Data and Methods

1.1 Materials

To assess the extent to which *Common Sense* deviated from prevailing norms in terms of accessibility and forcefulness, we needed to analyze not only its style and tone, but also the style and tone of polemical writings that preceded it. For this purpose, the best source of pre-Revolutionary polemics was Merrill Jensen's (1967) widely used collection of 17 pamphlets and newspaper articles, including *Common Sense*.¹ From this collection we excluded three documents: *Plain Truth*, a response to Paine written by James Chalmers that appeared after *Common Sense* was published; *Extracts from the Proceedings of the Court of Vice-Admiralty* by Henry Laurens, a recapitulation, in legal language, of a court proceeding; and *A Short Narrative of the Horrid Massacre in Boston* by James Bowdoin, Dr. Joseph Warren, and Samuel Pemberton, a narrative rather than a polemic. We also split one entry – an exchange of published letters between “Massachusettensis” (Daniel Leonard) and “Novanglus” (John Adams) – into two parts, analyzing Leonard's letters separately from Adams's. In all, then, Jensen's collection presented us with 14 pre-Revolutionary pamphlets to compare to *Common Sense*.² In order of publication, they were: *An Essay on the Trade of the Northern Colonies* by Stephen Hopkins (1764); *The Rights of the British Colonies Asserted and Proved* by James Otis (1764); *The Rights of Colonies Examined* by Stephen Hopkins (1764); *A Letter from a Gentleman at Halifax to His Friend in Rhode Island* by Martin Howard, Jr. (1765); *The Constitutional Courant: Containing Matters Interesting to Liberty, and No Wise Repugnant to Loyalty* attributed to William Goddard (1765); *Considerations on the Propriety of Imposing Taxes in the British Colonies, For the Purpose of Raising a Revenue, by Act of Parliament* by Daniel Dulany (1765); *An Inquiry into the Rights of the British Colonies* by Richard Bland (1766); *Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania to the Inhabitants of the British Colonies* by John Dickin-

son (1768); *The Nature and Extent of Parliamentary Power Considered* by William Hicks (1768); *A State of the Rights of the Colonists* attributed to Samuel Adams (1772); *A Summary View of the Rights of British America* by Thomas Jefferson (1774); *Massachusettensis* by Daniel Leonard (1774–75); *Novanglus* by John Adams (1774–75); and *A Candid Examination of the Mutual Claims of Great Britain, And the Colonies: With a Plan of Accommodation on Constitutional Principles* by Joseph Galloway (1775).

1.2 Measures

1.2.1 Accessibility

The accessibility of the arguments made in these pamphlets to a mass audience might be gauged in many different ways. For example, much has been made of the pomposity of eighteenth century authors, who habitually sprinkled their works with Greek and Latin quotations and referred “familiarly to Plato and Aristotle, to Catullus and Cicero, even if [their] argument concerned nothing more important than the right to catch fish in a pond” (Woodward, 1946, pp. 68–69). Paine, by contrast, “assumed knowledge of no authority but the Bible [and] provided immediate translations for the few Latin phrases he employed” (Foner, 1976, p. 83). Accordingly, a count of Greek and Latin constructions and classical allusions might provide a reasonable measure of inaccessibility to a mass audience. However, the standard measures of the accessibility of a text are simplicity in sentence construction and in word choice. Particularly in pre-Revolutionary times, when so many Americans were barely literate or not literate at all, authors who did not express themselves in simple words linked in simple sentences had little chance of being widely understood. Accordingly, we adopted the number of words per sentence and the percentage of “long” words (here defined as words of six letters or more) in a pamphlet as our measures of accessibility. If *Common Sense* was indeed a radical departure in terms of accessibility, then it should stand out from the remaining pre-Revolutionary pamphlets in its avoidance of long words and its use of short sentences.

1.2.2 Forcefulness

In comparing Paine's forcefulness in *Common Sense* to that of the other pamphleteers, we relied on a conceptualization that can be traced back to ancient times but lives on in modern personality psychology

(Eysenck, 1967). According to this conceptualization, there are four basic human temperaments: sanguinic (enthusiastic, optimistic, sociable, impersistent, and irresponsible), melancholic (conservative, responsible, pessimistic, and anxious), choleric (impetuous, ego-centric, active, and proud), and phlegmatic (calm, controlled, reasonable, and apathetic). Considered jointly, these temperaments are quadrants of two polar dimensions, corresponding to dimensions that are widely recognized in modern personality psychology – extravert (sanguinic and choleric) v. introvert (melancholic and phlegmatic) and neurotic (choleric and melancholic) v. stable (sanguinic and phlegmatic).³ Martindale and Martindale (1988) developed a content analysis dictionary to measure the four temperaments. The dictionary consists of 1,063 words which are assigned to four categories – choleric, phlegmatic, sanguinic, and melancholic. The dictionary was based on words said to be indicative of each of the temperaments by several theorists – Kant (1798/1978, Eysenck and Eysenck (1969), and Galen (as summarized by Roback, 1927). Synonyms of these words were found in *Roget's Thesaurus* (1978) and added to the dictionary. Ambiguous or multiple-meaning words were, of course, excluded. Sample words for each of the categories are as follows: Melancholic (anxious, concerned, critical, pessimistic, worried), Sanguinic (carefree, contented, enthusiastic, hopeful), Choleric (active, ambitious, greedy, impulsive, irritable), Phlegmatic (apathetic, calm, inactive, slow, steadfast).

Martindale and Martindale used this content analysis dictionary to analyze the translated works of 21 French poets by determining the frequency with which words indicative of each temperament appeared in a given poem. After counting the number of words indicative of each temperament in a poem, they standardized the temperament scores across poems and calculated the difference between the standardized frequencies in theoretically opposite temperaments (sanguinic v. melancholic and choleric v. phlegmatic); thus a high score on the sanguinic-melancholic dimension indicated that a particular poet's words were indicative of a sanguinic temperament as compared to a melancholic one, while a high score on the choleric-phlegmatic dimension indicated a preponderance of the former over the latter. The dictionary-based classifications of the French poets' temperaments showed a high correlation with classification by four internationally recognized literary critics.

Forcefulness is characteristic of the sanguinic and choleric temperaments, while its opposite, restraint,

is consistent with the melancholic and phlegmatic temperaments. Accordingly, we used the Martindale-Martindale temperament word lists to place each of the 15 pamphlets on the two bipolar temperament dimensions. If *Common Sense* really differed from other pre-Revolutionary pamphlets in terms of the forcefulness of its arguments, it would be expected to register unusually high scores on both the sanguinic-melancholic and the choleric-phlegmatic dimensions.

2. Findings

The second column of Table 1 shows the mean length of the sentences in each pamphlet.⁴ Of the 14 that preceded *Common Sense*, the tersest contained 23.2 words per sentence and the most long-winded, half again that many (34.4). As can be seen in the third column of the table, these pamphlets also varied in their use of long words, which comprised 28.7% to 34.5% of the words the authors of these pamphlets employed. Overall, then, the sentences in these pamphlets ran on at considerable length and contained a substantial share of long words. These pamphlets would have been challenging reading for a potential mass audience in the eighteenth century.

How different was *Common Sense* from the other pamphlets in sentence and word length? What stands out in Table 1 is that sentences were shorter (22.7 words per sentence) and long words were rarer in *Common Sense* (28.5% of the text) than in any of the other pre-Revolutionary pamphlets. Indeed, *Common Sense* was quite distinctive in both respects; on each measure, the difference between it and the other 14 pamphlets ($t(13) = -4.7$ and -4.5 , respectively, $p < 0.001$) was highly significant.⁵ It seems fair to conclude, then, that compared to other pamphleteers of the pre-Revolutionary era, Paine relied to an unusual degree on short sentences containing short words and that *Common Sense* was therefore more accessible to a mass audience than was the norm for that era.

The fourth and fifth columns of Table 1 show each pamphlet's scores on the sanguinic-melancholic and choleric-phlegmatic dimensions. Here, the distinctiveness of *Common Sense* is even more clearcut. On the sanguinic-melancholic dimension, *Common Sense* stood alone at 2.28, far away from any other pamphlet ($t(13) = 11.8$, $p < 0.001$). The sharp contrast between Paine's pungent language and the reserved, carefully measured language of other pre-Revolutionary pamphleteers was, then, strongly borne out in these

Table 1. Accessibility and forcefulness data for the 15 pre-Revolutionary pamphlets.

Pamphlet	Accessibility		Forcefulness	
	Sentence length	Long words	Sanguinic-melancholic	Choleric-phlegmatic
S. Hopkins (1764)	32.8	0.292	-0.83	1.68
J. Otis (1764)	23.2	0.287	0.68	-0.65
S. Hopkins (1764)	24.6	0.290	0.55	-0.49
M. Howard (1765)	25.6	0.311	0.48	2.14
W. Goddard? (1765)	24.2	0.293	-0.91	0.65
D. Dulany (1765)	33.9	0.341	0.39	-0.67
R. Bland (1766)	29.4	0.313	0.79	-0.32
J. Dickinson (1768)	24.8	0.307	0.28	-1.09
W. Hicks (1768)	34.4	0.345	-0.57	0.21
S. Adams (1772)	31.6	0.324	-1.11	-1.41
T. Jefferson (1774)	31.3	0.316	-1.01	-0.45
D. Leonard (1774-75)	23.7	0.329	0.77	-1.30
J. Adams (1774-75)	25.2	0.304	-0.76	-0.34
J. Galloway (1775)	25.7	0.317	-1.03	-1.09
Mean for the 14 above	27.8	0.312	-0.16	-0.23
Standard error for the 14 above	1.1	0.005	0.21	0.29
T. Paine (1776)	22.7	0.285	2.28	3.15

data. On the choleric-phlegmatic dimension, *Common Sense* was no less distinctive. The energy and vigor with which Paine made his arguments came through clearly in his pamphlet's score of 3.15 on this dimension, far above the mean of -0.23 for the 14 other pamphlets ($t(13) = 11.8$, $p < 0.001$).

In sum, by each of the four standards we employed, *Common Sense* differed significantly from other political pamphlets of the pre-Revolutionary era. Paine used fewer long words and wrote in shorter sentences than any other pamphleteer, thereby achieving the simple, unadorned style he sought. No less importantly, his tone was far different from that of any other pamphleteer; whereas others conveyed reserve and passivity, Paine, to an unparalleled degree, conveyed energy and activity.

Just how distinctive was *Common Sense*? To provide an overall answer to this question, we transposed the data in Table 1, intercorrelated the 15 pamphlets, and performed a multidimensional scaling analysis on the correlation matrix, following the conventional strategy of retaining the simplest dimensional solution that fit the data – in this case, a two-dimensional solution. We then calculated the squared Euclidean distance between each pair of pamphlets in the resulting two-dimensional space. With 15 pamphlets, this produced a matrix of 105 nonredundant

distances. We then conducted a series of 15 one-way analyses of variance (one for each pamphlet) to test the null hypothesis that the 14 distances from a given pamphlet to all the rest were not significantly different from the 91 that did not involve the pamphlet in question. These analyses are summarized in Table 2, which shows the mean distance between a pamphlet and the 14 others, the mean distance between each pair of the 14 other pamphlets, the proportion of the variance in pairwise differences associated with a particular pamphlet (expressed by the explained variance statistic $[\eta^2]$ from analysis of variance), and the statistical significance of this result. As Table 2 reveals, 14 of these 15 analyses yielded nonsignificant results; that is, notwithstanding the differences among them, 14 of the 15 pamphlets could not be considered significantly different from the rest. The lone exception was *Common Sense*, which was so unlike the other pamphlets that by itself it accounted for more than 60 percent of the variance in dissimilarity between pairs of pamphlets ($\eta^2 = 0.607$, $p < 0.001$).⁶

3. Conclusion

Because it played such a vital role in preparing the American colonies for the fight for independence

Table 2. Distances between pairs of pamphlets.

Pamphlet	Mean distance in pairs involving this pamphlet	Mean distance in pairs not involving this pamphlet	η^2 sig.
S. Hopkins (1764)	5.0	4.2	0.003 > 0.05.
J. Otis (1764)	3.7	4.4	0.003 > 0.05
S. Hopkins (1764)	2.9	4.5	0.012 > 0.05
M. Howard (1765)	5.5	4.1	0.010 > 0.05
W. Goddard? (1765)	4.0	4.3	0.000 > 0.05
D. Dulany (1765)	2.6	4.5	0.018 > 0.05
R. Bland (1766)	2.8	4.5	0.014 > 0.05
J. Dickinson (1768)	3.7	4.4	0.002 > 0.05
W. Hicks (1768)	2.4	4.6	0.024 > 0.05
S. Adams (1772)	3.2	4.5	0.007 > 0.05
T. Jefferson (1774)	2.5	4.6	0.019 > 0.05
D. Leonard (1774–75)	6.0	4.0	0.019 > 0.05
J. Adams (1774–75)	2.6	4.5	0.019 > 0.05
J. Galloway (1775)	3.3	4.4	0.007 > 0.05
T. Paine (1776)	14.1	2.8	0.607 < 0.0001

η^2 gives the proportion of variance explained in an analysis of variance.

from England, *Common Sense* has been an object of intense study over the years. It has not, however, been subjected to the type of scrutiny that computer-based textual analysis makes possible. Accordingly, the prevailing consensus concerning why Paine's pamphlet had such an immediate and dramatic impact has been achieved without benefit of systematic, replicable modes of analysis. The motivation for the present study was not to debunk the conventional wisdom about *Common Sense*, but rather to test it using more rigorous analytical tools than had previously been put to this task. The results of our tests bear out the prevailing interpretation by demonstrating that *Common Sense* did indeed constitute a departure from other polemical writings of its time in terms of accessibility and forcefulness.

Besides performing this verification function, our results establish, with far greater precision than had previously been attained, how and to what degree *Common Sense* differed from other pre-Revolutionary pamphlets. Had Paine's style differed only subtly from that of other leading polemicists of his era, he undoubtedly would have failed in the mission he set for himself, that of engaging and agitating a mass audience. However, the findings presented here testify to truly fundamental stylistic differences between Paine and other pamphleteers and to the uniqueness of Paine's authorial voice – a voice so influential that John Adams,

notwithstanding his misgivings about the man, was moved to proclaim the three decades that began in 1776 “the Age of Paine” (quoted by Hawke, 1974, p. 1).

Notes

¹ In what follows, we refer to these documents generically as “pamphlets.” As Jensen notes, there was little or no distinction between pamphlets and letters to newspapers; indeed, most of the latter were subsequently published as pamphlets.

² Jensen printed several of these documents in abridged form. His descriptions indicate that he omitted unusually long-winded or abstruse portions. Such omissions should, if anything, reduce any observed differences between “Common Sense” and the abridged documents with respect to simplicity.

³ See Martindale and Martindale (1988) for a discussion of these dimensions and their role in theories of personality.

⁴ To derive the data given in Table 1, we scanned the pamphlets from Jensen (1967) and analyzed the resulting text files using the Alexis 1.4 content analysis program for DOS-based microcomputers (McKenzie, 1995); for information concerning Alexis, interested readers should contact McKenzie at deanm@vaxc.cc.monash.edu.au.

⁵ These results were obtained using the one-sample *t*-test given by McNemar (1962, p. 101).

⁶ It is worth noting that the only pamphlets besides *Common Sense* that even came close to standing out in terms of overall distance from the remaining pamphlets (especially those by Hicks and Dulany) achieved their distinctiveness not by being unusually simple or forceful, but by employing exceptionally long sentences and using an exceptionally high proportion of long words. Thus, to the extent

that they stood out, it was because of their *inaccessibility* to a mass audience.

References

- Aldridge, Alfred O. *Man of Reason: The Life of Thomas Paine*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1959.
- Edwards, Samuel [Noel B. Gerson]. *Rebel! A Biography of Tom Paine*. New York: Praeger, 1974.
- Eysenck, H.J. *The Biological Basis of Personality*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1967.
- Foner, Eric. *Tom Paine and Revolutionary America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Fruchtman, Jack, Jr. *Thomas Paine: Apostle of Freedom*. New York: Foot Walls Eight Windows, 1994.
- Hawke, David F. *Paine*. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.
- Jensen, Merrill (Ed.). *Tracts of the American Revolution 1763-1776*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1967.
- Keane, John. *Tom Paine: A Political Life*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1995.
- Martindale, Anne E. and Colin Martindale. "Metaphorical Equivalence of Elements and Temperaments: Empirical Studies of Bachelard's Theory of Imagination." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55 (1988), 836-848.
- McKenzie, Dean. "Alexis 1.4" [computer program and user documentation]. Clayton, Victoria: Monash University, 1995.
- McNemar, Q. *Psychological Statistics*, 3rd ed. New York: Wiley, 1962.
- Smith, Frank. *Thomas Paine, Liberator*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes, 1938.
- Woodward, William E. *Tom Paine: America's Godfather 1737-1809*. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1946.